	Case 3:04-cv-00667-LRH-RAM Document	55 Filed 06/06/06 Page 1 of 2
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
8	* * * *	
9	HORATIO DE MARIOUS SMITH,	
10	Plaintiff,) 03:04-CV-0667-LRH (RAM)
11	VS.	
12	DANIELLE DETWILER, et al.,	ORDER)
13	Defendants.	
14		
15	Before this court is the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge	
16	Robert A. McQuaid, Jr. (#50¹) entered on January 5, 2006. The Magistrate Judge recommends	
17	this court grant Defendants' Motion to Dismiss (#28). Plaintiff, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §	
18	636(b)(1) and Local Rule 1B 3-2, filed objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report and	
19	Recommendation (#52) on January 19, 2006. Defendants have filed an opposition (#53) to	
20	which Plaintiff has replied (#54).	
21	The Court has conducted its <i>de novo</i> review in this case and has fully considered	
22	Plaintiff's objections, the pleadings and memoranda of the parties and other relevant matters of	
23	record. The Court determines that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation,	
24	recommending that Plaintiff's claim be dismissed on the ground of <i>res judicata</i> , should be	
25	adopted and accepted.	
26	Plaintiff objects to dismissal of his complaint on the ground that he had never properly	
27	joined the current parties in his previous lawsuit, therefore precluding a judgment on the merits	
28		
	References to (#XX) refer to the court's docket.	
	1	

Case 3:04-cv-00667-LRH-RAM Document 55 Filed 06/06/06 Page 2 of 2

1	in the previous case because dismissal was necessarily pursuant to Rule 19. However, Plaintiff	
2	did not need to follow Rule 19 to advance a claim against the current defendants as he was given	
3	an opportunity to and did file a Sixth Amended Complaint(#28, Ex. A) in which he named the	
4	current defendants. The dismissal in that matter, as made clear by the report and	
5	recommendation which formed the basis for dismissal (#28, Ex. C), was not based on Plaintiff's	
6	failure to join a party, but rather on Plaintiff's failure to state a claim upon which relief could be	
7	granted pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6). Plaintiff also objects that he did not raise an Eighth	
8	Amendment claim in his previous lawsuit. A reading of the complaint (#28, Ex. A) in that	
9	matter and the order dismissing Plaintiff's claims (#28, Ex. C) clearly shows a different story.	
10	The Magistrate Judge was not incorrect in determining that the doctrine of res judicata applies in	
11	this instance.	
12	It is therefore ORDERED that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (#50)	
13	is adopted and accepted. Defendants' Motion to Dismiss (#28) is GRANTED.	
14	The Clerk shall enter judgment accordingly.	
15	DATED this 5 th day of June, 2006.	
16	Elsihe	
17	Outour	
18	LARRY R HICKS	
19	United States District Judge	
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		